

c. means for displaying first level children nodes of said first node in the center of the map;

d. means for displaying children nodes of said first level children nodes;

e. means for receiving user selection for a second node; and

f. means for repeating steps (a)-(e) for said second node.

96. (Original) The system of claim 82, wherein said processing unit is further configured for editing information on the map in response to a user selection.

REMARKS

Claims 1-96 are currently pending, with claims 1, 23, 53 and 75 in independent form. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-96 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being allegedly anticipated by Khavakh, US Patent No. 6,678,611. Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A method for creating a node in a node map for a user interface in a computing device comprising: receiving a user instruction for initiating creation of the new node; receiving node information from the user; generating a new node with the received node information; and listing the new node in a node list. (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that the elements recited in independent claim 1 are not anticipated by the cited reference.

Khavakh is directed to a “Method and System for Route Calculation in a Navigation Application.” More specifically, the Khavakh patent is directed to generating “route calculation” based on “information contained in a map database that represents a road network in a geographic region.” (See, Khavakh abstract)(emphasis added). Khavakh implements the navigational tool that generates a geographic map through object-oriented programming. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is over-generalizing Khavakh’s object-oriented programming objects by alleging Khavakh’s geographical “nodes” anticipate the “node” recited in the pending claims.

Applicants submit that Khavakh’s use of the term “node” is not analogous to the term “node” as recited in the pending claims and as one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the term, in light of the specification. Khavakh defines the term “node” as “[n]ode data represent physical locations in the geographic region (such as roadway intersections and other positions) and segment data represent portions of roadways between the physical locations represented by nodes.” (See, Khavakh, col. 4, lines 45-50). Moreover, as illustrated by Khavakh’s Fig. 2, the disclosed “nodes” and segments are simply waypoints used to provide directions between two physical locations represented in geographical regions on a map and do not teach, disclose or suggest creating a new node in a node map, and listing the node in a node list as recited in the claims and discussed in the specification.

The claimed interface creation tool creates fully-personalized and contextualized user interfaces for terminals in mobile use, by generating a node map for a user interface by creating a node based on received node information and listing the new node in a node list. By way of example only, the specification illustrates nodes in Fig. 2 and discusses “nodes” as:

[An] individual node 210, category 220 or relationship 230 may also have any number of associated attributes. The term node is used hereinafter to refer to individuals 210 and categories 220, and the word edge is used to refer to relationships 230 in the map 200, when discussing the visual representation of the map 200, and when discussing the map on the data structure level (as opposed to the conceptual level).

[0050] Individuals 210 and categories 220 may be further subdivided into notes, actions, applications, attachments, outlined entries, and/or the like. Each terminal has its own API that may (or may not) support an application. For example, a call application may be supported by mobile phone APIs but not by DigiTV APIs. Actions that are defined in terms of applications derivatively may (or may not) also be supported by a terminal. For example, the action of calling home may be supported by mobile phones but not DigiTVs. An application node is a link to any application, such as a mail program or a schedule tool. Double-clicking a previously defined application node by a pointing device starts the application. In another embodiment, double-clicking a previously defined application node that is in the center of the display by a pointing device starts the application. (See, Paragraphs, [0049-0050]).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Khavakh’s geographic nodes are not analogous to the claimed nodes and that the cited reference has been improperly over-generalized. For example the Examiner alleges, that Khavakh’s disclosure “the user interface includes appropriate equipment allow end-user to input information into navigation; see col. 4, lines 8-31]....” anticipates the “initiating construction of a new node” as recited in independent claim 1. (See, Office Action, page 2, paragraph 3). Applicants respectfully disagree and submit

that the cited passage merely discloses generic computer input components. Specifically the cited passage discloses, “The equipment used to input information into the navigation system may include a keypad, a keyboard, a microphone...display 27, speakers 29 or other means...” (See, Khavakh, col. 4, lines 16-22). Applicants respectfully submit Khavakh’s disclosure of conventional computer components do not anticipate the elements recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants submit that the disclosure of a conventional computer components do not teach, disclose or suggest, “receiving a user instruction for initiating creation of the new node” in a node map. For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art in light of the specification would understand that Khavakh’s waypoint nodes in his map-creating tool are not analogous to the claimed user-interface creation tool.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit “node” as recited in independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from Khavakh’s geographical waypoints. Similarly, Applicants submit that independent claims 23, 53, and 75, as well as claims 2-22, 24-52, 54-74 and 76-96, which are directly or indirectly dependent from amended independent claims 1, 23, 53, and 75 respectively, are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least a similar reason. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of these grounds of rejections.

CONCLUSION


For all the reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this response, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4030.

Applicants believe that no extension of time is required for Examination of the Response on its merits. However, in the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to hereby requesting such a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4030.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: March 21, 2005

By: 
Daniel C. Sheridan
Registration No. 53,585

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281-2101
(212) 415-8700 Telephone
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile